



(3) The certificate of appealability under paragraph (1) shall indicate which specific issue or issues satisfy the showing required by paragraph (2).

28 U.S.C. § 2253(c).

A “substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right” requires a demonstration “that reasonable jurists could debate whether (or, for that matter, agree that) the petition should have been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were “adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further.”” *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000) (quoting *Barefoot v. Estelle*, 463 U.S. 880, 893 & n.4 (1983)).

As stated in the previous Memorandum and Order, the § 2255 motion was untimely. For the reasons set forth in the Court’s previously issued Amended Memorandum and Order (Filing No. 99) denying the defendant’s § 2255 motion, the Court concludes that the Defendant has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right as required by 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c).

IT IS ORDERED:

1. Defendant Angela Lynn White’s Notice of Appeal (Filing No. 101) is construed as a Motion for Certificate of Appealability, and such a motion is denied;
2. The Court denies the Defendant leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal;
3. The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Memorandum and Order to the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals; and
4. The Clerk is directed to mail a copy of this Memorandum and Order to Defendant at her last known address.

DATED this 25<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2013.

BY THE COURT

s/Laurie Smith Camp  
Chief United States District Judge